arXiv:1303.2452v1 [math.PR] 11 Mar 2013

MAX-STABLE PROCESSES AND THE FUNCTIONAL D-NORM REVISITED

STEFAN AULBACH, MICHAEL FALK AND MARTIN HOFMANN

Abstract. Aulbach et al. (2012) introduced some mathematical framework for extreme value theory in the space of continuous functions on compact intervals. Continuous max-stable processes on $[0, 1]$ were characterized by their functional distribution function, which can be represented via a norm on function space, called D-norm.

The high conformity of this setup with the multivariate case led to the introduction of a functional max-domain of attraction approach for stochastic processes, which is more general than the one based on weak convergence investigated by de Haan and Lin (2001). In this paper we will characterize this max-domain of attraction condition for stochastic processes in $C[0, 1]$ via uniform ordinary weak convergence of the one dimensional margins, together with max-domain of attraction of the pertaining copula processes.

Furthermore we introduce certain δ-neighborhoods of generalized Pareto processes, which can be characterized by their rate of convergence towards a max-stable process. This is in complete accordance with the multivariate case.

Finally, it turns out that a max-stable process with standard negative exponential margins can be characterized by its maximum value relative to a given threshold function, yielding another negative exponential distribution. Based on this observation, we present tests for max-stable and for generalized Pareto processes.

1. Introduction

A stochastic process $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ on the interval $[0, 1]$, which realizes in the space $C[0, 1]$ of continuous functions on $[0, 1]$, is called *max-stable* (MSP), if there are norming functions $a_n > 0$, $b_n \in C[0, 1]$, such that the distribution of the process $\max_{1\le i\le n}\big(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)} - b_n\big)/a_n$ coincides with that of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(2)}, \dots$ we denote independent copies of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 60G70, secondary 62M99.

Key words and phrases. Max-stable process, D-norm, functional max-domain of attraction, copula process, generalized Pareto process, δ-neighborhood of generalized Pareto process, t-test for max-stable and for generalized Pareto process.

The first author was supported by DFG Grant FA 262/4-2.

Aulbach et al. (2012) established a characterization of the distribution of an MSP via a norm on $E[0,1]$, the space of bounded functions on $[0,1]$ which have finitely many discontinuities. This norm is called D-norm and it is defined by means of a so-called generator process.

An MSP $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in C[0,1]$ with standard negative exponential margins $P(\eta_t \le x) = \exp(x)$, $x \le 0$, will be called a *standard max-stable* process (SMSP). As the distribution of a stochastic process on $[0,1]$ is determined by its finite dimensional marginal distributions, a process $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in C[0,1]$ with identical marginal df $F(x) = \exp(x)$, $x \le 0$, is standard max-stable if and only if

$$P\left(\boldsymbol{\eta} \le \frac{f}{n}\right)^n = P(\boldsymbol{\eta} \le f), \qquad f \in E^-[0,1],\, n \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $E^-[0,1]$ denotes the subset of those functions in $E[0,1]$, which attain only non positive values. From Aulbach et al. (2012) we know that in this case

$$P(\boldsymbol{\eta} \le f) = \exp(-\|f\|_D), \qquad f \in E^-[0,1], \tag{1}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_D$ is a norm on $E[0,1]$, called *D-norm*. Precisely, there exists a stochastic process $\boldsymbol{Z} = (Z_t)_{t\in[0,1]} \in C[0,1]$ with

$$0 \le Z_t \le m, \quad E(Z_t) = 1, \qquad t \in [0,1],$$

for some number $m \ge 1$, such that

$$\|f\|_D = E\left(\sup_{t\in[0,1]} (|f(t)| Z_t)\right), \qquad f \in E[0,1].$$

The condition $Z_t \le m$, $t \in [0,1]$, can be weakened to $E\left(\sup_{t\in[0,1]} Z_t\right) < \infty$.

Based on this characterization, Aulbach et al. (2012) introduced a functional domain of attraction approach for stochastic processes, which is more general than the one based on weak convergence as investigated in de Haan and Lin (2001).

In this paper we will characterize in Section 2 max-domain of attraction for stochastic processes in $C[0,1]$ via uniform ordinary weak convergence of the onedimensional margins, together with max-domain of attraction of the pertaining copula processes. This is in accordance with the characterization in the usual weak-convergence approach as given in Buishand et al. (2008, Proposition 2.1).

Buishand et al. (2008) suggested the definition of *generalized Pareto processes* (GPP), which extends the multivariate approach to function spaces. This particular approach was investigated and settled in Ferreira and de Haan (2012) and Aulbach et al. (2012). In this paper we will introduce in Section 3 certain δ-neighborhoods of GPP, which can be characterized by their rate of convergence towards a max-stable process. This is in complete accordance with the multivariate case.

The representation of the distribution of an SMSP in terms of a D-norm $\|\cdot\|_D$ immediately entails that its maximum exceedance above an arbitrary function $f \in E^-[0,1]$ is negative exponential distributed with parameter $\|f\|_D$. This observation, which is in fact a characterization of an SMSP, suggests to test for a SMSP via ordinary t-tests. This will be done in Section 4.

To improve the readability of this paper we use bold face such as $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, $\boldsymbol{X}$ for stochastic processes and default font f, a_n etc. for non stochastic functions. Operations on functions such as $\boldsymbol{\xi} < f$ or $(\boldsymbol{\xi} - b_n)/a_n$ are meant pointwise. The usual abbreviations *df, fidis, iid, a.s.* and *rv* for the terms *distribution function, finite dimensional distributions, independent and identically distributed, almost surely* and *random variable*, respectively, are used.

2. A Characterization of Max-Domain of Attraction

Let $\boldsymbol{X} = (X_t)_{t\in[0,1]} \in C[0,1]$ be a stochastic process with continuous marginal df $F_t(x) = P(X_t \le x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $t \in [0,1]$, and let $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]} \in C[0,1]$ be an MSP with marginal df G_t, $t \in [0,1]$. Suppose that there exist norming functions $a_n > 0$, $b_n \in C[0,1]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \left| n\big(F_t(a_n(t)x + b_n(t)) - 1\big) - \log\big(G_t(x)\big)\right| \to_{n\to\infty} 0 \tag{2}$$

for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $G_t(x) > 0$, $t \in [0,1]$. This is condition (3.11) in de Haan and Lin (2001). Using Taylor expansion $\log(1+\varepsilon) = \varepsilon + O(\varepsilon^2)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, condition (2) implies in particular weak convergence of the univariate margins, i.e.,

$$F_t(a_n(t)x + b_n(t))^n \to_{n\to\infty} G_t(x), \qquad x \in \mathbb{R},\ t \in [0,1].$$

Put $\boldsymbol{U} := (U_t)_{t\in[0,1]} := (F_t(X_t))_{t\in[0,1]}$, which is the *copula process* corresponding to $\boldsymbol{X}$. Let $\boldsymbol{U}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{U}^{(2)}, \dots$ be independent copies of $\boldsymbol{U}$, and let $\boldsymbol{X}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{X}^{(2)}, \dots$ be independent copies of $\boldsymbol{X}$. The following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 2.1. *We have under condition* (2)

$$P\left(\max_{1\le i\le n} \frac{\boldsymbol{X}^{(i)} - b_n}{a_n} \le f\right) \to_{n\to\infty} P(\boldsymbol{\xi} \le f), \qquad f \in E[0,1], \tag{3}$$

if and only if

$$P\left(n \max_{1\le i\le n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)} - 1\right) \le g\right) \to_{n\to\infty} P(\boldsymbol{\eta} \le g), \qquad g \in E^-[0,1], \tag{4}$$

where for the implication (3) $\implies$ (4) *we set* $\eta_t := \log(G_t(\xi_t))$, $t \in [0,1]$, *and for the reverse conclusion* $\xi_t := G_t^{-1}(\exp(\eta_t))$, $t \in [0,1]$. *In both cases the processes* $\boldsymbol{\xi} := (\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\eta} := (\eta_t)_{t\in[0,1]} \in C[0,1]$ *are max-stable,* $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ *being an SMSP.*

By Lemma 1 in Aulbach et al. (2012) or the elementary arguments as in the proof of Theorem 9.4.1 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006), one obtains that $P(G_t(\xi_t) = 0$ for some $t \in [0,1]) = 0$, i.e., the processes $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ are well defined.

Proof. As $\boldsymbol{X}$ has continuous sample paths, we have continuity of the function $[0,1] \ni t \mapsto G_t(x)$ for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and, thus, continuity of the function $[0,1] \times \mathbb{R} \ni (t,x) \mapsto G_t(x)$ as well as its monotonicity in x for a fixed t. Elementary arguments now imply that condition (2) is equivalent with

$$\sup_{x\in[x_1,x_2]} \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \left| n\big(F_t(a_n(t)x + b_n(t)) - 1\big) - \log\big(G_t(x)\big)\right| \to_{n\to\infty} 0 \tag{5}$$

for each $x_1 \le x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $G_t(x_1) > 0$, $t \in [0,1]$. As $G_t(x_1)$ is a continuous function in $t \in [0,1]$, this condition on x_1 is equivalent with $\inf_{t\in[0,1]} G_t(x_1) > 0$. Condition (5) is, therefore, equivalent with

$$\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \left| n\big(F_t(a_n(t)f(t) + b_n(t)) - 1\big) - \log\big(G_t(f(t))\big)\right| \to_{n\to\infty} 0 \tag{6}$$

for each $f \in E[0,1]$ with $\inf_{t\in[0,1]} G_t(f(t)) > 0$.

We first establish the implication (3) $\implies$ (4). Choose $g \in E^-[0,1]$ with $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} g(t) < 0$ and put $f(t) := G_t^{-1}(\exp(g(t))$. Then $f \in E[0,1]$ and we obtain from assumption (3)

$$P\left(\max_{1\le i\le n} \boldsymbol{X}^{(i)} \le a_n f + b_n\right) \to_{n\to\infty} P(\boldsymbol{\xi} \le f) = P(\boldsymbol{\eta} \le g) = \exp(-\|g\|_D), \tag{7}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_D$ is the D-norm corresponding to the SMSP $\boldsymbol{\eta}$.

We have, on the other hand, by condition (6)

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\max_{1\le i\le n} \boldsymbol{X}^{(i)} \le a_n f + b_n\right) \\ &= P\left(n \max_{1\le i\le n}\left(U_t^{(i)} - 1\right) \le n\big(F_t(a_n(t)f(t) + b_n(t)) - 1\big),\, t \in [0,1]\right) \\ &= P\left(n \max_{1\le i\le n}\left(U_t^{(i)} - 1\right) \le g(t) + r_n(t),\, t \in [0,1]\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $r_n(t) = o(1)$ as $n \to \infty$, uniformly for $t \in [0,1]$. We claim that

$$P\left(n \max_{1\le i\le n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)} - 1\right) \le g\right) \to_{n\to\infty} P(\boldsymbol{\eta} \le g). \tag{8}$$

Replace g by $g + \varepsilon$ and $g - \varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that $g + \varepsilon < 0$, and put

$$f_\varepsilon(t) := G_t^{-1}(\exp(g(t) + \varepsilon)), \quad f_{-\varepsilon}(t) := G_t^{-1}(\exp(g(t) - \varepsilon)), \qquad t \in [0,1].$$

Then $f_\varepsilon, f_{-\varepsilon} \in E[0,1]$, and we obtain from condition (6) and equation (7) for $n \ge n_0$

$$P\left(n \max_{1\le i\le n}\left(U_t^{(i)} - 1\right) \le n\big(F_t(a_n(t)f_\varepsilon(t) + b_n(t)) - 1\big),\, t \in [0,1]\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq P\left(n \max_{1\leq i\leq n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\leq g\right)\\
&\geq P\left(n \max_{1\leq i\leq n}\left(U_t^{(i)}-1\right)\leq n\big(F_t(a_n(t)f_{-\varepsilon}(t)+b_n(t))-1\big),\, t\in[0,1]\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the upper bound converges to $\exp(-\|g+\varepsilon\|_D)$ and the lower bound to $\exp(-\|g-\varepsilon\|_D)$. As both converge to $\exp(-\|g\|_D)$ as $\varepsilon\to 0$, we have established (8).

Next we claim that (8) is true for each $g\in E^-[0,1]$, i.e., we drop the assumption $\sup_{t\in[0,1]} g(t)<0$. We prove this by a contradiction. Suppose first that there exists $g\in E^-[0,1]$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} P\left(n \max_{1\leq i\leq n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\leq g\right)\leq \exp(-\|g\|_D)-\delta$$

for some $\delta>0$. From (8) we deduce that for each $\varepsilon>0$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P\left(n \max_{1\leq i\leq n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\leq g-\varepsilon\right)=\exp(-\|g-\varepsilon\|_D)$$

and, thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp(-\|g\|_D)-\delta\\
&\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} P\left(n \max_{1\leq i\leq n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\leq g\right)\\
&\geq \liminf_{n\to\infty} P\left(n \max_{1\leq i\leq n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\leq g-\varepsilon\right)\\
&= \exp(-\|g-\varepsilon\|_D).
\end{aligned}$$

As $\varepsilon>0$ was arbitrary, we have reached a contradiction and, thus, we have established that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} P\left(n \max_{1\leq i\leq n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\leq g\right)\geq \exp(-\|g\|_D),\qquad g\in E^-[0,1].$$

Suppose next that there exists $g\in E^-[0,1]$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} P\left(n \max_{1\leq i\leq n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\leq g\right)\geq \exp(-\|g\|_D)+\delta$$

for some $\delta>0$. We have by (8) for $\varepsilon>0$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P\left(n \max_{1\leq i\leq n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\leq -\varepsilon\right)=\exp(-\varepsilon\|1\|_D)\to_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0} 1,$$

and, thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp(-\|g\|_D)+\delta\\
&\leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} P\left(n \max_{1\leq i\leq n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\leq g\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\le \limsup_{n\to\infty}\Bigg(P\bigg(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\Big)\le g,\, n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\Big)\le -\varepsilon\bigg) + P\bigg(\Big(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\Big)\le -\varepsilon\Big)^{\complement}\bigg)\Bigg)$$

$$= \exp\big(-\big\|(\min(g(t),-\varepsilon)_{t\in[0,1]}\big\|_D\big)+1-\exp(-\varepsilon\|1\|_D)$$

by (8). As the first term in the final line above converges to $\exp(-\|g\|_D)$ as $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$ and the second one to zero, we have established another contradiction and, thus,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}P\bigg(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\Big)\le g\bigg)\le\exp(-\|g\|_D),\qquad g\in E^-[0,1].$$

This proves equation (8) for arbitrary $g\in E^-[0,1]$ and completes the proof of the conclusion (3) $\implies$ (4).

Next we establish the implication (4) $\implies$ (3). Choose $f\in E[0,1]$ with $\inf_{t\in[0,1]}G_t(f(t))>0$ and put $g(t):=\log(G_t(f(t)))$, $t\in[0,1]$. From the assumption (4) we obtain

$$P\bigg(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\Big)\le g\bigg)\to_{n\to\infty}P(\boldsymbol{\eta}\le g)=P(\boldsymbol{\xi}\le f)=\exp(-\|g\|_D).$$

On the other hand, we have by condition (2)

$$P\bigg(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\Big)\le g\bigg)$$
$$=P\bigg(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}_t^{(i)}-1\Big)\le n\big(F_t(a_n(t)f(t)+b_n(t))-1\big)+r_n(t),\, t\in[0,1]\bigg),$$

where $r_n(t)=o(1)$ as $n\to\infty$, uniformly for $t\in[0,1]$. We claim that

$$P\bigg(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}_t^{(i)}-1\Big)\le n\big(F_t(a_n(t)f(t)+b_n(t))-1\big),\, t\in[0,1]\bigg)$$
$$\to_{n\to\infty}P(\boldsymbol{\eta}\le g)$$
$$=\exp(-\|g\|_D).\tag{9}$$

Replace g by $\min(g+\varepsilon,0)$ and $g-\varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon>0$ is arbitrary. Then we obtain from (4) and condition (2) for $n\ge n_0=n_0(\varepsilon)$

$$P\bigg(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\Big)\le\min(g+\varepsilon,0)\bigg)$$
$$=P\bigg(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\Big)\le g+\varepsilon\bigg)$$
$$\ge P\bigg(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\Big)\le n\big(F_t(a_n(t)f(t)+b_n(t))-1\big),\, t\in[0,1]\bigg)$$
$$\ge P\bigg(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\Big(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\Big)\le g-\varepsilon\bigg).$$

Since

$$P\left(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\le \min(g+\varepsilon,0)\right)\to_{n\to\infty}\exp(-\|\min(g+\varepsilon,0)\|_D)$$

as well as

$$P\left(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\le g-\varepsilon\right)\to_{n\to\infty}\exp(-\|g-\varepsilon\|_D)$$

and $\varepsilon>0$ was arbitrary, (9) follows.

From the equality

$$\begin{aligned}&P\left(n\max_{1\le i\le n}\left(\boldsymbol{U}^{(i)}-1\right)\le n\big(F_t(a_n(t)f(t)+b_n(t))-1\big),\,t\in[0,1]\right)\\&=P\left(\max_{1\le i\le n}\boldsymbol{X}^{(i)}\le a_nf+b_n\right)\end{aligned}$$

and from (9) we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}P\left(\max_{1\le i\le n}\boldsymbol{X}^{(i)}\le a_nf+b_n\right)=P(\boldsymbol{\xi}\le f) \tag{10}$$

for each $f\in E[0,1]$ with $\inf_{t\in[0,1]}G_t(f(t))>0$. If $\inf_{t\in[0,1]}G_t(f(t))=0$, then, for $\varepsilon>0$, there exists $t_0\in[0,1]$ such that $G_{t_0}(f(t_0))\le\varepsilon$. We, thus, have $P(\boldsymbol{\xi}\le f)\le P(\xi_{t_0}\le f(t_0))=G_{t_0}(f(t_0))\le\varepsilon$ and, by condition (6),

$$\begin{aligned}P\left(\max_{1\le i\le n}\boldsymbol{X}^{(i)}\le a_nf+b_n\right)&\le P\left(\max_{1\le i\le n}X_{t_0}^{(i)}\le a_n(t_0)f(t_0)+b_n(t_0)\right)\\&\to_{n\to\infty}G_{t_0}(f(t_0))\le\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

As $\varepsilon>0$ was arbitrary, we have established

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}P\left(\max_{1\le i\le n}\boldsymbol{X}^{(i)}\le a_nf+b_n\right)=0=P(\boldsymbol{\xi}\le f)$$

in that case, where $\inf_{t\in[0,1]}G_t(f(t))=0$ and, thus, (10) for each $f\in E[0,1]$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1. □

Corollary 2.2. *Let $\boldsymbol{X}=(X_t)_{t\in[0,1]}\in C[0,1]$ be a stochastic process with identical continuous marginal df $F(x)=P(X_t\le x)$, $x\in\mathbb{R}$, $t\in[0,1]$, and let $\boldsymbol{\xi}=(\xi_t)_{t\in[0,1]}\in C[0,1]$ be an MSP with identical marginal df G. Denote by $\boldsymbol{U}=(U_t)_{t\in[0,1]}:=(F(X_t))_{t\in[0,1]}$ the copula process pertaining to $\boldsymbol{X}$. Then we have $\boldsymbol{X}\in\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{U}\in\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ and $F\in\mathcal{D}(G)$.*

For a characterization of the condition $\boldsymbol{U}\in\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ in terms of certain neighborhoods of generalized Pareto processes see Proposition 3.4 below.

Proof of Corollary 2.2. The assumption $F\in\mathcal{D}(G)$ yields $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}}|F^n(a_nx+b_n)-G(x)|\to_{n\to\infty}0$ for some sequence of norming constants $a_n>0$, $b_n\in\mathbb{R}$, $n\in\mathbb{N}$.

Taking logarithms and using Taylor expansion of $\log(1+x)$ for $x \in [x_0, x_1]$ with $x_0 > 0$ implies

$$\sup_{x\in[x_0,x_1]} |n(F(a_n x + b_n) - 1) - \log(G(x))| \to_{n\to\infty} 0$$

and, thus, condition (2) is satisfied. Corollary 2.2 is now an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.1 together with the fact that the assumption $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ implies in particular that $F \in \mathcal{D}(G)$. □

3. δ-Neighborhood of a Generalized Pareto Process

First we recall some facts from Aulbach et al. (2012). A univariate generalized Pareto distribution (GPD) W is simply given by $W(x) = 1+\log(G(x))$, $G(x) \geq 1/e$, where G is a univariate extreme value distribution (EVD). It was established by Pickands (1975) and Balkema and de Haan (1974) that, roughly, the maximum of n iid univariate observations, linearly standardized, converges in distribution to an EVD as n increases if, and only if, the exceedances above an increasing threshold follow a generalized Pareto distribution (GPD). The multivariate analogon is due to Rootzén and Tajvidi (2006). It was observed by Buishand et al. (2008) that a d-dimensional GPD W with ultimately standard Pareto margins can be represented in its upper tail as $W(\boldsymbol{x}) = P(U^{-1}\boldsymbol{Z} \leq \boldsymbol{x})$, $\boldsymbol{x}_0 \leq \boldsymbol{x} \leq \boldsymbol{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where the rv U is uniformly on $(0,1)$ distributed and independent of the rv $\boldsymbol{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_d)$ with $0 \leq Z_i \leq m$ for some $m \geq 1$ and $E(Z_i) = 1$, $1 \leq i \leq d$. The following definition extends this approach to function spaces.

Definition 3.1. Let U be an on $[0,1]$ uniformly distributed rv, which is independent of the generator process $\boldsymbol{Z} \in C[0,1]$ that is characterized by the two properties

$$0 \leq Z_t \leq m \quad \text{and} \quad E(Z_t) = 1, \qquad t \in [0,1],$$

for some constant $m \geq 1$. Then the stochastic process

$$\boldsymbol{Y} := \frac{1}{U}\boldsymbol{Z} \ \in C^+[0,1].$$

is a *generalized Pareto process* (GPP) (Buishand et al., 2008; Ferreira and de Haan, 2012).

The univariate margins Y_t of $\boldsymbol{Y}$ have ultimately standard Pareto tails:

$$\begin{aligned} P(Y_t \leq x) &= P\left(\frac{1}{x} Z_t \leq U\right) \\ &= \int_0^m P\left(\frac{1}{x} z \leq U\right) (P * Z_t)(dz) \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{x}\int_0^m z\,(P * Z_t)(dz) \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= 1-\frac{1}{x}E(Z_t)\\
&= 1-\frac{1}{x}, \qquad x \ge m,\, 0 \le t \le 1.
\end{aligned}
$$

Put $\boldsymbol{V} := \max(-1/\boldsymbol{Y}, M)$, where $M < 0$ is an arbitrary constant, which ensures that $\boldsymbol{V} > -\infty$. Then, by Fubini's Theorem,

$$
\begin{aligned}
P(\boldsymbol{V} \le f) &= P\left(\sup_{t\in[0,1]} (|f(t)|Z_t) \le U\right)\\
&= 1-\int_0^1 P\left(\sup_{t\in[0,1]} (|f(t)|Z_t) > u\right) du\\
&= 1-E\left(\sup_{t\in[0,1]} (|f(t)|Z_t)\right)\\
&= 1-\|f\|_D
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $f \in E^-[0,1]$ with $\|f\|_\infty \le \min(1/m, |M|)$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{V}$ has the property that its functional df is in its upper tail equal to

$$
\begin{aligned}
W(f) &:= P(\boldsymbol{V} \le f)\\
&= 1-\|f\|_D\\
&= 1+\log(\exp(-\|f\|_D))\\
&= 1+\log(G(f)), \qquad f \in E^-[0,1],\ \|f\|_\infty \le \min(1/m, |M|), \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $G(f) = P(\boldsymbol{\eta} \le f)$ is the functional df of the MSP $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ with D-norm $\|\cdot\|_D$ and generator $\boldsymbol{Z}$.

The preceding representation of the upper tail of a GPP in terms of $1+\log(G)$ is in complete accordance with the uni- and multivariate case (see, for example, Falk et al., 2011, Chapter 5). We write $W = 1 + \log(G)$ in short notation and call $\boldsymbol{V}$ a GPP as well.

Remark 3.2. Due to representation (11), the GPD process $\boldsymbol{V}$ is obviously in the functional domain of attraction of an SMSP $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ with D-norm $\|\cdot\|_D$ and generator $\boldsymbol{Z}$: Take $a_n = 1/n$ and $b_n = 0$. We have for $f \in E^-[0,1]$ and large enough $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$
P\left(\boldsymbol{V} \le \frac{1}{n}f\right)^n = \left(1-\frac{1}{n}\|f\|_D\right)^n \to_{n\to\infty} \exp(-\|f\|_D) = P(\boldsymbol{\eta} \le f).
$$

The following result is a functional version of the well-known fact that the spectral df of a GPD random vector is equal to a uniform df in a neighborhood of zero.

Lemma 3.3. *We have for* $f \in E^-[0,1]$ *with* $\|f\|_\infty \le m$ *and some* $s_0 < 0$

$$W_f(s) := P(\boldsymbol{V} \le s|f|) = 1 + s\|f\|_D, \qquad s_0 \le s \le 0.$$

Let $\boldsymbol{U}$ be a copula process. The next result is established in Aulbach et al. (2012).

Proposition 3.4. *The property* $\boldsymbol{U} \in \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ *is equivalent with the condition*

$$\lim_{s \uparrow 0} \frac{1 - H_f(s)}{1 - W_f(s)} = 1, \qquad f \in E^-[0,1], \tag{12}$$

i.e., the spectral df $H_f(s) = P(\boldsymbol{U} - 1 \le s|f|)$, $s \le 0$, *of* $\boldsymbol{U} - 1$ *is tail equivalent with that of the GPD* $W_f = 1 + \log(G_f)$, $G(\cdot) = \exp(-\|\cdot\|_D)$.

Next we define the standard GPP we are working with in what follows.

Definition 3.5. A stochastic process $\boldsymbol{V} \in C^-[0,1]$ is a *standard generalized Pareto process* (SGPP), if there exists a D-norm $\|\cdot\|_D$ on $E[0,1]$ and some $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$P(\boldsymbol{V} \le f) = 1 - \|f\|_D$$

for all $f \in E^-[0,1]$ with $\|f\|_\infty \le c_0$.

Using the spectral decomposition of a stochastic process in $C^-[0,1]$, we can easily extend the definition of a spectral δ-neighborhood of a multivariate GPD as in Falk et al. (2011, Section 5.5) to the spectral δ-neighborhood of a SGPP. Denote by $E_1^-[0,1] = \{f \in E^-[0,1] : \|f\|_\infty = 1\}$ the unit sphere in $E^-[0,1]$.

Definition 3.6. We say that a stochastic process $\boldsymbol{Y} \in C^-[0,1]$ belongs to the *spectral δ-neighborhood* of the SGPP $\boldsymbol{V}$ for some $\delta \in (0,1]$, if we have uniformly for $f \in E_1^-[0,1]$ the expansion

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - P(\boldsymbol{Y} \le cf) &= (1 - P(\boldsymbol{V} \le cf))\big(1 + O\big(c^\delta\big)\big) \\ &= c\|f\|_D\big(1 + O\big(c^\delta\big)\big) \end{aligned}$$

as $c \downarrow 0$.

An SMSP is, for example, in the spectral δ-neighborhood of the corresponding GPP with $\delta = 1$.

The following result on the rate of convergence extends Theorem 5.5.5 in Falk et al. (2011) on the rate of convergence of multivariate extremes to functional extremes.

Proposition 3.7. *Let* $\boldsymbol{Y}$ *be a stochastic process in* $C^-[0,1]$, $\boldsymbol{V}$ *a SGPP with* D-*norm* $\|\cdot\|_D$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ *a corresponding SMSP.*

(i) *Suppose that* $\boldsymbol{Y}$ *is in the spectral* δ*-neighborhood of* $\boldsymbol{V}$ *for some* $\delta \in (0,1]$. *Then we have*

$$\sup_{f\in E^-[0,1]}\left|P\left(\boldsymbol{Y}\le \frac{f}{n}\right)^n - P(\boldsymbol{\eta}\le f)\right| = O\big(n^{-\delta}\big).$$

(ii) *Suppose that* $H_f(c) = P(\boldsymbol{Y} \le c|f|)$ *is differentiable with respect to* c *in a left neighborhood of* 0 *for any* $f \in E_1^-[0,1]$, *i.e.,* $h_f(c) := (\partial/\partial c)H_f(c)$ *exists for* $c \in (-\varepsilon, 0)$ *and any* $f \in E_1^-[0,1]$. *Suppose, moreover, that* H_f *satisfies the von Mises condition*

$$\frac{-ch_f(c)}{1-H_f(c)} =: 1 + r_f(c) \to_{c\uparrow 0} 1, \qquad f \in E_1^-[0,1],$$

with remainder term r_f *satisfying*

$$\sup_{f\in E_1^-[0,1]}\left|\int_c^0 \frac{r_f(t)}{t}\,dt\right| \to_{c\uparrow 0} 0.$$

If

$$\sup_{f\in E^-[0,1]}\left|P\left(\boldsymbol{Y}\le \frac{f}{n}\right)^n - P(\boldsymbol{\eta}\le f)\right| = O\big(n^{-\delta}\big)$$

for some $\delta \in (0,1]$, *then* $\boldsymbol{Y}$ *is in the spectral* δ*-neighborhood of the GPP* $\boldsymbol{V}$.

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{f\in E^-[0,1]}\left|P\left(\boldsymbol{Y}\le \frac{f}{n}\right)^n - P(\boldsymbol{\eta}\le f)\right|\\
&= \sup_{f\in E^-[0,1]}\left|P\left(\boldsymbol{Y}\le \frac{\|f\|_\infty}{n}\frac{f}{\|f\|_\infty}\right)^n - P\left(\boldsymbol{\eta}\le \|f\|_\infty \frac{f}{\|f\|_\infty}\right)\right|\\
&= \sup_{c<0}\ \sup_{f\in E_1^-[0,1]}\left|P\left(\boldsymbol{Y}\le \frac{c}{n}|f|\right)^n - P(\boldsymbol{\eta}\le c|f|)\right|\\
&= \sup_{f\in E_1^-[0,1]}\ \sup_{c<0}\left|P\left(\boldsymbol{Y}\le \frac{c}{n}|f|\right)^n - P(\boldsymbol{\eta}\le c|f|)\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

The assertion now follows by repeating the arguments in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Falk and Reiss (2002), where the bivariate case has been established. □

4. Testing for a Standard Max-Stable Process

Let $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_t)_{t\in[0,1]} \in C[0,1]$ be a SMSP. Representation (1) is obviously equivalent with the equation

$$P\left(\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \frac{\eta_t}{|f(t)|} \le x\right) = \exp(x\|f\|_D), \qquad x \le 0,\ f\in E[0,1],$$

i.e., the univariate rv

$$\eta_f := \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \frac{\eta_t}{|f(t)|}$$

is for each $f \in E[0,1]$, which is not the constant function zero, negative exponential distributed with parameter $\|f\|_D$. As this property characterizes an SMSP, the idea suggests itself to use it for testing for a SMSP.

Suppose that we are given n independent copies $\eta_f^{(1)},\dots,\eta_f^{(n)}$ of η_f. A well-known technique consists of transforming the observations $\eta_f^{(1)},\dots,\eta_f^{(n)}$ to

$$U_{(i)} := \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{i} \eta_f^{(j)}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \eta_f^{(j)}}, \qquad i = 1,\dots,n-1.$$

Then the rv $(U_{(1)},\dots,U_{(n-1)})$ is distributed as the vector of ordered observations in a sample of $n-1$ independent and uniformly on $(0,1)$ distributed rv, cf. Reiss (1989, Corollary 1.6.9). Each test, which checks for the underlying distribution of $U_{(1)},\dots,U_{(n-1)}$ such as Kolmogorov-Smirnov or chi-square goodness-of-fit can be applied to test, whether $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is, actually, an SMSP.

We prefer to transform each $U_{(i)}$ by the inverse Φ^{-1} of the standard normal df Φ, i.e., we put

$$\xi_{(i)} := \Phi^{-1}(U_{(i)}), \qquad i = 1,\dots,n-1,$$

and, thus,

$$T_{f,n-1} := \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_{(i)}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\xi_{(i)} - \bar{\xi}_{n-1}\right)^2\right)^{1/2}},$$

with

$$\bar{\xi}_{n-1} := \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_{(i)},$$

follows a t-distribution with $n-2$ degrees of freedom, denoted by t_{n-2}, if $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is, actually, a SMSP. This is the hypothesis H_0.

Observing a complete stochastic process on $[0,1]$ might be too ambitious. More realistic is its observation through a grid $S = \{t_1,\dots,t_d\}$ of points $0 \le t_1 < \dots < t_d \le 1$. Denote by

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_S := (\eta_{t_1},\dots,\eta_{t_d})$$

the projection of the process $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ onto the index set S. The rv $\boldsymbol{\eta}_S$ satisfies

$$P(\boldsymbol{\eta}_S \le \boldsymbol{x}) = \exp\left(-\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{D_S}\right), \qquad \boldsymbol{x} \le \boldsymbol{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where the D-norm is given by

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{D_S} = E\left(\max_{1\le i\le d} (|x_i| Z_{t_i})\right), \qquad \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

This is a consequence of equation (1). The univariate rv

$$\eta_{\boldsymbol{x}} := \max_{1\le i\le d} \frac{\eta_{t_i}}{|x_i|}$$

is, therefore, for each $\boldsymbol{x} \neq \boldsymbol{0} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ negative exponential distributed with parameter $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{D_S}$.

We proceed as before and put

$$U_{S,(i)} := \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{i} \eta_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{(j)}}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \eta_{\boldsymbol{x}}^{(j)}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \xi_{S,(i)} := \Phi^{-1}\bigl(U_{S,(i)}\bigr), \qquad i = 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Then the test statistic

$$T_{S,\boldsymbol{x},n-1} := \frac{\frac{1}{(n-1)^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_{S,(i)}}{\left(\frac{1}{n-2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \bigl(\xi_{S,(i)} - \bar{\xi}_{S,n-1}\bigr)^2\right)^{1/2}},$$

with

$$\bar{\xi}_{S,n-1} := \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \xi_{S,(i)},$$

is again t_{n-2}-distributed if $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is an SMSP.

The preceding considerations can also be utilized to test for a standard GPP. Let $\boldsymbol{V}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{V}^{(n)}$ be independent copies of the standard GPP $\boldsymbol{V}$, i.e., there exists a positive number x_0 such that

$$P(\boldsymbol{V} \le f) = 1 - \|f\|_D, \qquad f \in E^-[0,1],\ \|f\|_\infty \le x_0.$$

As a consequence, for $f \in E^-[0,1]$ with $\|f\|_\infty \le x_0$, we have

$$P\left(\sup_{t\in[0,1]} \frac{V_t}{|f(t)|} > x \right) = |x| \|f\|_D, \qquad -1 \le x \le 0,$$

i.e., the rv

$$V_f := \sup_{t\in[0,1]} \frac{V_t}{|f(t)|}$$

follows in its upper tail, precisely on $(-1,0)$, a uniform distribution. We can now consider only those observations $V_f^{(i)}$ among $V_f^{(1)}, \dots, V_f^{(n)}$, which exceed the value -1. This provides a sample $U_{f,1}, \dots, U_{f,\tau(n)}$ of independent and on $(-1,0)$ uniformly distributed rv, which are also independent of their number $\tau(n)$ that is binomial $B(n, p_f)$-distributed with parameters n and $p = 1 - \|f\|_D$ (cf. Reiss, 1993, Theorem 1.4.1). We assume that $0 < \|f\|_D < 1$.

The test statistic

$$T_{f,\tau(n)} := \frac{\frac{1}{\tau(n)^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(n)} \Phi^{-1}(-U_{f,i})}{\left(\frac{1}{(\tau(n)-1)^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(n)} \bigl(\Phi^{-1}(-U_{f,i}) - \bar{\mu}_{\tau(n)}\bigr)^2\right)^{1/2}}$$

with

$$\mu_{\tau(n)} := \frac{1}{\tau(n)} \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(n)} \Phi^{-1}(-U_{f,i})$$

follows, conditional on $\tau(n) = k \geq 2$, a t-distribution with $k-1$ degrees of freedom.

We can again substitute the interval $[0,1]$ by a grid S of points and observe the processes $\boldsymbol{V}^{(i)}$ only through their projections onto this grid as before. This does not alter the conditional t-distribution of the corresponding test statistic $T_{S,f,\tau(n)}$.

An omnibus test of the preceding kind for testing for a standard GPP was investigated in Aulbach and Falk (2012*b*). But it was outperformed by asymptotic optimal tests that are tailor-made for the parametric families under consideration; see also Aulbach and Falk (2012*a*).

References

Aulbach, S., and Falk, M. (2012*a*). Local asymptotic normality in δ-neighborhoods of standard generalized Pareto processes. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **142**, 1339–1347. `doi:10.1016/j.jspi.2011.12.011`.

Aulbach, S., and Falk, M. (2012*b*). Testing for a generalized Pareto process. *Electron. J. Stat.* **6**, 1779–1802. `doi:10.1214/12-EJS728`.

Aulbach, S., Falk, M., and Hofmann, M. (2012). On max-stable processes and the functional D-norm. *Extremes*. `doi:10.1007/s10687-012-0160-3`.

Balkema, A. A., and de Haan, L. (1974). Residual life time at great age. *Ann. Probab.* **2**, 792–804. `doi:10.1214/aop/1176996548`.

Buishand, T. A., de Haan, L., and Zhou, C. (2008). On spatial extremes: with application to a rainfall problem. *Ann. Appl. Stat.* **2**, 624–642. `doi:10.1214/08-AOAS159`.

Falk, M., Hüsler, J., and Reiss, R.-D. (2011). *Laws of Small Numbers: Extremes and Rare Events.* 3rd ed. Springer, Basel. `doi:10.1007/978-3-0348-0009-9`.

Falk, M., and Reiss, R.-D. (2002). A characterization of the rate of convergence in bivariate extreme value models. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **59**, 341–351. `doi:10.1016/S0167-7152(02)00209-2`.

Ferreira, A., and de Haan, L. (2012). The generalized Pareto process; with a view towards application and simulation. Tech. Rep. `arXiv:1203.2551v2 [math.PR]`.

de Haan, L., and Ferreira, A. (2006). *Extreme Value Theory: An Introduction.* Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering. Springer, New York. See `http://people.few.eur.nl/ldehaan/EVTbook.correction.pdf` and `http://home.isa.utl.pt/~anafh/corrections.pdf` for corrections and extensions.

DE HAAN, L., and LIN, T. (2001). On convergence toward an extreme value distribution in $C[0,1]$. *Ann. Probab.* **29**, 467–483. `doi:10.1214/aop/1008956340`.

PICKANDS, J., III (1975). Statistical inference using extreme order statistics. *Ann. Statist.* **3**, 119–131. `doi:10.1214/aos/1176343003`.

REISS, R.-D. (1989). *Approximate Distributions of Order Statistics: With Applications to Nonparametric Statistics*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York.

REISS, R.-D. (1993). *A Course on Point Processes.* Springer, New York.

ROOTZÉN, H., and TAJVIDI, N. (2006). Multivariate generalized Pareto distributions. *Bernoulli* **12**, 917–930. `doi:10.3150/bj/1161614952`.

[1] UNIVERSITY OF WÜRZBURG, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, EMIL-FISCHER-STR. 30, 97074 WÜRZBURG, GERMANY.

E-mail address: `stefan.aulbach@uni-wuerzburg.de`, `michael.falk@uni-wuerzburg.de`, `hofmann.martin@mathematik.uni-wuerzburg.de`